

The Common Market threatens British freedom...



...GET BRITAIN OUT!

SPEARHEAD comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the Common Market

Market negotiations a fraud

The summit conference of E.E.C. Prime Ministers in Dublin in March marked the climax of one of the most squalid frauds ever to be sprung upon the British people. The fraud consisted of the posture which Harold Wilson has maintained for the last four years that he and his party are not bound hand and foot to support of Britain's membership of Europe, and that they would disengage Britain from the European Community "if the right terms could not be obtained."

The fraud was necessary to Wilson for two reasons. First, a not insubstantial section of the Labour Party is anti-Market to one degree or another. Throughout the last four years, and particularly throughout 1974, when the party had to engage in two General Elections, the possibility, however dubious, that Labour would come down on the anti-



END OF THE BIG ACT
Wilson cuts celebration cake with Market bosses

Market side, had the desired effect of buying off would be party rebels just at a time when their rebellion would have been the greatest embarrassment to Mr. Wilson.

Secondly, the fence-sitting tactics over the Market undoubtedly were beneficial to Labour in terms of votes. It is highly probable that it would not have won either election in 1974 had it not been for the fact that, while the Tories and Liberals were irrevocably committed to stay in the Market,

Labour offered, or seemed to the electorate to offer, at least some chance that Britain would come out. The spoof was well aided and abetted by Mr. Enoch Powell, who went about telling people to vote Labour — as if he actually believed that a Labour Government might take us out. How many hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, who normally would not vote Labour did so merely because Mr. Powell told them it was a good idea? Whatever the number, in a narrowly won election it might well have been decisive.

What we forecast

Of course, we never had any illusions about Labour's attitude on Europe. When the charade of 'renegotiations' began with Mr. Callaghan's meetings with the Market bosses last year *Spearhead* commented that the plan would be for Callaghan to strike a tough pose so as to give the impression that British interests were being stoutly defended. A bout of apparent 'hard bargaining' would be enacted for several months, with Market leaders making appropriate noises of protest, then at the end the 'terms' negotiated would be announced as a victory for Britain and good cause for the Government to recommend that we stay in the Market.

This is exactly what happened. The act of Market intransigence was maintained right up to the last but one day. Messrs. Schmidt and Giscard d'Estaing were reported on that day to have been about to leave the Dublin Conference and fly home — so uncompromising was the stand for British

SPEARHEAD

No. 83 April 1975

Office: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Editor: John Tyndall Asst. Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

interests that Messrs. Wilson and Callaghan were alleged to have been taking! Yet, Presto! The next day everything was settled. Smiles all round. Agreement had been reached!

A Scottish Nationalist MP summed the whole thing up very aptly when he said that the Common Market negotiators on both sides had looked like TV wrestlers, making no end of fierce noises at one another but never intending each other any injury.

Bogus 'victory'

The Government thereupon announced the substance of its 'victory' to the public. Just so as to not make it seem too much of a confidence trick Mr. Wilson 'confessed' that it had not been a "complete" victory, falling a little short of the terms that he had hoped to get when the negotiations began. Nevertheless, he was very pleased. Mr. Callaghan, it was reported, was even more pleased.

In what did the 'victory' consist. Put into perspective beside the broader issues of the Market, it was mere peanuts. A slight concession was obtained in the amount of money Britain would have to pay towards the Market Fund. New Zealand butter exports to Britain obtained a stay of execution for a further 3 years, and there were some other minor adjustments in the Common Agricultural Policy.

Loaded referendum

Now for the promised referendum on the Market, and from the facts available it is likely that this is going to be as bogus an affair as the 'negotiations' that preceded it.

The very wording of the question in the referendum is loaded for a start. The words chosen are: "Do you think that the United Kingdom should stay in the European Community?"

"Stay in" has a distinct advantage over any opposite proposition, as it implies leaving things as they are rather than changing them. The history of referenda bears out very strongly that people not much committed or informed — which the majority usually is — tend to vote for what sounds likel keeping the *status quo* rather than altering it. Had the words been something like "be a member of", the question would have been much less loaded.

The other clever use of words is "European Community". To begin with, since the words are used a great deal less than "Common Market" they could cause confusion to many of the politically ill read as to exactly what it is we are going to stay in or come out of. Perhaps even more to the point, precisely because such words are less in use they are less discredited. Anyway, "Community" has a 'nice' sound, whereas "Market" has to many people a sound that is not so nice. One suggests friendship, co-



MR. POWELL SPEAKS AGAINST MARKET
His advice to voters helped Labour's spoof

operation, togetherness; the other suggests haggling, price-cutting and perhaps swindling!

The propaganda build-up

Even more loaded than the referendum question itself is the build up of propaganda, neatly mis-named 'information', that is certain to precede it. We are informed that a popular version of the Government White Paper recommending a 'Yes' vote will be printed and distributed by the millions to every household at Government (i.e. the taxpayers') expense. Add to this the vast resources enjoyed by the various other pro-Market organisations, and one has an idea of just how fair the debate is going to be.

For a start, there is now not one single great national daily newspaper that is anti-Market. The Beaverbrook press, which bore the anti-Market banner alone up till recently, has made a craven sell-out to the pro-Market side. Every day the British public over its breakfast table and then later over its dinner table is going to get bombarded with pro-Market propaganda — with very little in the way of a reply except the occasional letter in the correspondence columns.

Big money on side of Europe

Enormous funds, some of them from distinctly foreign sources, back up the pro-Market campaign on other fronts, while that of the anti-Marketeers has to be run, relatively speaking, on a shoestring. To get an idea of the uneven balance of forces one only has to visit the respective Headquarters of the European Movement, which leads the campaign to stay in, and the Common Market Safeguards Campaign, which is the most prominent body on the other side. The European Movement has its offices in Whitehall Place, certainly one of the most expensive areas in London, where a full time staff of 40 are at work. The CMSC, in contrast, rents a small and shabby shop in Fulham High Street, some way out in the suburbs, where a tiny fraction of that number is employed.

Such opinion polls as have so far been conducted have established that a huge proportion of the public is simply confused about the facts of the Common Market and earnestly seek 'information'. There is no doubt which way most of the 'information' is going to be slanted.

The 'Noes' can win

Nevertheless, there is every possibility that, despite this massive weighting of propaganda in favour of the pro-Market side, the people will vote 'No' when the referendum comes. A similar thing happened in Norway when that country held its referendum. All the big guns of money and propaganda were on the pro-Market side and a victory for that side was confidently forecast. Yet on the day the anti-Market vote proved the larger and Norway stayed out. It was one of the best things she ever did. While the E.E.C. economy is now stagnating, Norway's is booming and is one of the most prosperous in the world.

It is up to all British patriots to now put everything into the fight to obtain a 'No' vote when the referendum comes. But whatever the result of that vote the battle to get Britain out will carry on. And, as we have stated on page 20 of this issue, getting Britain out of the Common Market is merely a part of the task that we have before us to put our country back on the map. Because the fight against the Market is no more than a part of a wider fight for national survival, we are confident that in the course of time it will be the National Front that will take the lead in this struggle. Alone among the organisations opposing the Common Market, the NF has a comprehensive policy for British recovery which embraces the whole spectrum of political and economic issues.

So paramount is the question of the Common Market over the next few weeks, we have devoted this entire number of *Spearhead* to that question. In the following pages we analyse the consequences of British membership from every angle, and we feel sure that at the end the reader can only come to one conclusion: that the most urgent task of our generation is to **GET BRITAIN OUT!**

Under Common Market rules the British Government cannot make grants to British firms without Market approval.

Local councils in Britain cannot build houses if the contract is worth more than £145,000 until it has been advertised in the Common Market countries. Bedford and Manchester are two local authorities whose plans have been delayed because of this ruling.

William Haferkamp, top Market bureaucrat and economic commissioner has predicted virtual stagnation of the economies of the E.E.C. countries.

The Common Market Commission plans control over all Britain's resources, including nuclear energy, oil, gas and coal. One rule that it intends to enforce is that British industry will not be allowed to buy North Sea oil at a lower price than that prevailing in the Common Market.

Common Market bureaucrats are insisting that Britain lifts restrictions on large scale investment in Europe, with the result that capital-starved British industry would be even worse off than now.

Members of the European Parliament in Strasbourg have recently voted themselves an increase in their daily allowances of about £25 a day.

Butter, cheese and lamb from Australia and New Zealand are still cheaper than from E.E.C. countries. Recent prices for butter on the London Provision Exchange were: New Zealand £614 per long ton; German £628; French £651. The price for NZ butter includes a special E.E.C. levy of £127 per ton, whereas both the German and French prices are subsidised by the E.E.C.

When Norway had its referendum on the Common Market the pro-Market forecast economic doom for the country if it stayed out. The reverse has been the case. The Norwegian economy is now one of the fastest growing in Europe, with a rate of 6 per-cent a year. Norway has one of highest living standards in the world.

"On the real issues, Europe stumbles and slips downhill . . . We are losing our independence, we are lowering our sights, our institutions are failing in important areas . . . Our attempts to speak with a single voice on vital issues have failed miserably . . . We have lost our nerve, we have lost our vision." FRANCOIS XAVIER ORTOLI, PRESI-

EUROPE

FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW

DENT OF EUROPEAN COMMISSION, SPEAKING AT E.E.C. ASSEMBLY, FEBRUARY 18th.

Britain's current contribution to the E.E.C. budget is approximately £1,000 million a year. This works out to nearly £20 for every British man, woman and child. West Germany, Italy and France, countries of similar size of population to our own, all pay much less.

European countries paid over £20 million to destroy fruits and vegetables when their prices dropped too low during the last growing season.

British membership of the Common Market means that Market laws and taxes cannot be changed or repealed by the British Parliament but only by Common Market authorities not directly elected by the British people.

All the original Six countries of the E.E.C. levy a 7 per-cent tax on most non-life insurance premiums. 'Harmonisation' plans within the Community make it almost certain that insurance in Britain will in time be subject to the same tax.

Widespread and massive frauds are occurring in the administration of the Common Market's expensive farm policy budget. No-one knows exactly how much money goes astray but an informed source puts it at no less than £50 million a year.

The functioning of the Common Market Parliament in Strasbourg has become a complete farce. Debates have to be held up for long periods on account

of language difficulties which result in confusion in the interpretation of certain members' speeches.

A former police inspector writing in *Police Review* has forecast a huge crime boom in Europe as travel formalities are progressively abolished by E.E.C. legislation. This, the article said, will cause an explosion of work for detectives. Illegal immigrant traffic would be much easier. Removal of fishing limits will enable small boats to be used more freely in criminal operations.

"We must recognise that for us to sign the Treaty of Rome would be to accept as the ultimate goal political federation in Europe, including ourselves." REGINALD MAUDLING, HOUSE OF COMMONS 10th MAY 1967.

Identity cards are likely to become compulsory in Britain as part of 'harmonisation' with Europe. There is nothing in writing specifying such cards in the Treaty of Rome but five of the original Six members of the E.E.C. have laws making them compulsory for all citizens.

Since the Common Market was formed all its members have had lower economic growth rates than they enjoyed previously. Today the growth rate throughout the Market is slowing down alarmingly and unemployment is on the increase.

The next import from the E.E.C. that is planned is the variable V.A.T. rate. This is going to add hours every week of book-keeping time to those already spent. It is going to further cripple small businesses.

Inspectors for the Common Market VAT are now making midnight raids on small shopkeepers. Under the Finance Act of 1972 no warrant is necessary for entering or searching private premises. This gives tax inspectors more power than the Police.

It is estimated that 1½ million Australian cattle will starve or have to be shot because of the loss of the United Kingdom market now that the U.K. is in Europe.

British poultry farming is being wrecked by the dumping of heavily subsidised French eggs, which are being sold at well below the actual cost of production.

THE COMMON MARKET

THEY SAY...

- We cannot survive economically outside Europe.
- The European nations can only be prosperous by pooling their resources within the E.E.C.
- Membership of the E.E.C. gives British industry duty-free access to a market of 250 million people.
- Rises in food prices are world-wide. We would have had them even if we had stayed out of Europe.
- By going into the Common Market we are not losing sovereignty; we are sharing it.
- By acting together in the world, the European nations can have much more influence than any of them can when acting singly.
- Britain must turn to Europe because she has lost her favoured position with the Commonwealth.
- A united Europe is designed to offset American power.
- Unless they are united, the European nations could not defend themselves against Soviet attack.
- We may not be benefitting from European membership now but we must think of the benefits to posterity.

WE SAY...

- We have survived on our own economically for nearly 2,000 years.
- The most prosperous nations in Europe are Sweden, Norway and Switzerland — all outside the E.E.C.
- It also gives European industry duty-free access to the British market. In 1970 our trade deficit with the E.E.C. was £69 million. In 1974 it was over £2,000 million. We have lost much more trade in Britain than we have gained in Europe.
- We would not have had them to anything like the same extent. Since 1971 food prices in Britain and Ireland have risen by 43.6 per-cent and 46.6 per-cent respectively, while those of Sweden and Norway have risen by only 18.4 per-cent and 23.0 per-cent.
- This is sheer verbal acrobatics. If you 'share' a thing like sovereignty, you effectively lose it. You might as well talk of 'sharing' your wife!
- The same can be said theoretically of any grouping of nations. If we joined up with Soviet Russia we would supposedly be able to wield more influence together than either of us can wield singly, but does that make us want to do so? Anyway, there is little sign so far that the European nations can or wish to act together. The Middle Eastern oil crisis is a case in point.
- This is a reversal of the truth. We have lost our favoured position with the Commonwealth because of out commitment, since the early 1960s, to Europe. If we got out of Europe, we could start to retrieve our position with the Commonwealth.
- Then why have the Americans pushed so hard for a united Europe?
- This is poppycock. The military weakness of the Western European nations viz-a-viz those of the Warsaw pact lies in the liberalism and pacifism that permeates them and in the resultant lack of political will to spend adequate money on defence.
- This fine-sounding slogan obliges those who use it to produce some evidence of benefits to posterity. So far they have produced none. Any crackpot scheme can be argued as being beneficial to posterity so long as no concrete proof of the argument is required. The inhabitants of Russia's slave labour camps may as well be told that their suffering is for the good of posterity!


IT'S ALL BEEN TRIED BEFORE



THE ROMAN EMPIRE UNDER TRAJAN



THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE



NAPOLEON'S EMPIRE



HITLER'S 'NEW ORDER'

AND IT'S NEVER LASTED

One of the biggest frauds which the pro-Market brigade try and put across the British people is the idea that their cause is new and modern, and that those who oppose them are out of date and living in the past. In fact there is nothing whatever new or modern about the idea of a united Europe. It has all been tried before, and it has never lasted.

The Roman Empire was an attempt to establish a European Order, cutting across the boundaries of nationality. It crumbled when the spirit of nationhood asserted itself.

Successor to the Roman Empire was the Holy Roman Empire, in which the link between the outlying parts was a common allegiance to the Roman Church. In time the Holy Roman Empire disintegrated because it was not

founded on proper national lines.

Later there came Napoleon's Empire, which attempted to unite many European nations in common allegiance to the then new ideals of 'liberty, equality and fraternity'. It lasted much less time than either of the old Roman Empires.

Finally, within living memory there was Hitler's Reich. So far as Hitler tried to bring within a single union only German peoples he was successful and was supported by the great majority of those concerned. Once he extended his plans to that of building a 'European Order', he placed himself on the path to destruction.

Now they're at it again — those people who dream of a union of Europe. They have learnt nothing from history.

C.A.P.: madness or racket?

What does the E.E.C. Common Agricultural Policy boil down to?

Simply this: E.E.C. officials fix minimum prices for food, in other words we can't pay less no matter how cheap food may be elsewhere. Any food bought cheaply outside the Common Market is taxed (import levy or duty or both). If farmers in the E.E.C. over-produce the price doesn't come down; the surplus is either put into cold storage and later sold off outside the Market, or it is destroyed. Alternatively, the Intervention Boards 'denature' it, i.e. make it unfit to eat. The sole idea is to keep prices high within the Market.

Here is an example of the madness that results from this policy. When European farmers produced a surplus of butter some while ago, instead of the price being allowed to fall the butter was sold to Russia at 5p a pound, while we in Britain were paying 40p a pound.

Right now all over the Market we are actually **paying** farmers to render food unfit for consumption — and of course that payment becomes a part of the price of the food we do consume.

Britain has been paying her apple growers £100 an acre to grub up their orchards (plus an allowance for every tree destroyed) — for what? So that we can instead import French apples.

Last year the Common Market paid farmers over £21 million to destroy fruit and vegetables when prices dropped too low.

We have called this business madness, but perhaps it is something worse. The whole thing sometimes looks much more like a deliberate racket. The question is: if the European people don't benefit, who does?

THEY LIED TO US

The last Tory Government forecast in its White Paper on the E.E.C. that the cost of food as a result of British membership would go up by no more than 2½p in the £ per year. — Here is a comparison of some food prices before we entered the Market and now.

	1972	Now
Pork Chops (per lb.)	42p	64p
Sirloin steak (per lb.)	82p	£1.50
Cooked ham (per lb.)	50p	£1.20
Plaice (per lb.)	46p	65p
Eggs (per doz.)	15p	38p
Old potatoes (per 5lb.)	11p	20p
Carrots (per lb.)	7p	13p
Lettuce (per head)	8p	13p
Apples (per lb.)	10p	18p
Oranges (per lb.)	9p	30p
Jam (per lb.)	17p	29½p

Before we went in...

WHAT THEY SAID

HIGHER EXPORTS

Common Market entry would greatly improve Britain's export opportunities. Within the tariff wall our companies would be on equal footing with their Continental rivals.

Our trade with the Common Market would also be helped by the removal of those barriers other than tariffs which today hinder exports.

Taken from leaflet published by Conservative Central Office prior to Market entry.

WHAT WE SAID

Taken from article in *Spearhead*, August 1971.

The "vast new home market" of the Common Market does not promise great advantages to Britain, for the principal British exports to the E.E.C. are manufactured goods, and these encounter an average tariff at the present time of 7½ per-cent, while the current average tariff against E.E.C. goods entering Britain is 10 to 11 per-cent. Hence the lowering of these tariffs would benefit the European firms exporting to Britain much more than British firms exporting to Europe. In other words, membership of the E.E.C. would lose British firms more business in our own country than they would gain in Europe.

FACT

Before entry into the Common Market Britain's annual balance of trade deficit with the Market countries stood at £459 million a year. Since entry it has climbed to £2,785 million a year.

EEC Wine Fiddle

One of the very latest fiddles unveiled in the Common Market has been the way in which European taxpayers have been asked to subsidise the export of wine at knock-down prices to the Soviet Union.

Recently there has been a huge glut of wine in the Common Market, just like the glut of butter some little time ago.

To get rid of this surplus wine, the French are putting pressure on the E.E.C. to allow it to be sold to the Russians dirt cheap, while the wine producers concerned are paid a special subsidy to make the enterprise profitable. The subsidy, which is estimated at £25 million, will of course come out of the ordinary taxpayer's pocket.

More beef price rises

The Common Market Commission is planning another big rise in the price of beef, and to impose mandatory intervention buying of beef for storage on Britain.

Experts estimate that this further rise in beef prices, enforced by intervention-buying, would raise the Brussels beef mountain (which of course deteriorates in quality) to 800,000 tons by the end of the year, of which nearly 2,000 tons would be the British contribution.

Unhappily, as the *Financial Times* Agricultural Correspondent said on January 3rd, "Mr. Peart has lost the main battle by agreeing to the principle of beef intervention last November after opting out of it in April."

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF E.E.C. PROVE A MIRAGE

DURING the period when the last Conservative Government under Edward Heath was taking Britain into Europe without the full-hearted consent of Parliament and people, we were deluged with incredible claims about the miraculous effect which E.E.C. membership would have on Britain's economy.

"A market of 250 million people — that is something Britain just cannot afford not to be in on", raved the Marketeers. They tried to blind us all with science by waxing eloquent about the "Dynamic Effect" which a move into a bigger market and increased competition would have on British industry. It was claimed that these conditions would have the "Dynamic Effect" of stimulating British industry "so that it could not fail to increase its output".

More thoughtful economists such as Nicholas Kaldor warned: "The 'Dynamic Effect' of a bigger market and bigger competition is not proved or quantified". This warning was re-enforced by the then Minister for Industry Mr. John Davis who told an audience in Sweden (but not any British audiences!): "It is extraordinarily difficult to predict the growth of Britain's economy after entry into the E.E.C."

These and many other warning signals were swept aside by the paid public relations con-men of the pro-Market movement as they made wilder and wilder claims concerning the "beneficial effects" to Britain were she to join the E.E.C. European Movement propaganda claimed that not only would Britain's factories be producing more, and Britain's salesmen selling more, but that as a result Britain's workers would be earning more in real terms, would be given more holidays, during which times the sun would shine more brightly (yes — they actually made that claim!) O Promised Land . . . O Happy Days . . . O Utopia!

BRITAIN WORSE OFF

Now we have had a couple of years to sample these 'benefits'. We know from our own personal experience and observations that the average family in Britain is worse off thanks to Britain's membership of the Common Market, and we can see that there is not a single silver lining in sight.

In the previous special issue of *Spearhead* on the Common Market published

in 1971 we warned that the E.E.C. could not possibly help Britain's economy. In reference to the beneficial effects of the E.E.C. large market we said:

"The 'vast new home market' of the Common Market does not promise great advantages to Britain, for the principal British exports to the E.E.C. are manufactured goods, and these encounter an average tariff at the present time of 7½ per cent, while the current average tariff against E.E.C. goods entering Britain is 10 to 11 percent. Hence the lowering of these tariffs would benefit the European firms exporting to Britain much more than British firm exporting to Europe. In other words, membership to the E.E.C. would lose British firms more business in our own country than they would gain in Europe."

That prediction has now been officially endorsed by the present Minister for Trade, Mr. Peter Shore, who recently told the House of Commons:

"Britain's trade deficit with the E.E.C. is running at about £2 billion a year, or half the total deficit excluding oil."

The pro-Common Market magazine *The Economist* (15th March) tried to construct all manner of excuses for this disastrous situation, but none the less had to admit that the figures bore out the truth of Mr. Shore's statement. It lamely went on to say: "Commission economists see hope of a genuine improvement in Britain's trade performance with the E.E.C. soon". Promises, promises!

The Economist did at least have the courage to finally kill stone dead the "Dynamic Effects" theory which was such an important plank in the platform of the pro-Market propagandists three and four years ago. It observed:

"Only the simple-minded will believe that intra-community trade will repeat its performance of increasing elevenfold (or twice as fast as world trade as a whole) since customs union began in 1959."

"There must also be doubts about the related argument that a home market of 250 million people will at last stimulate industrial development in Britain. The latest British survey on investment intentions by the Department of Trade suggests, that manufacturing investment in Britain this year, despite heavy investment in North Sea oil, will in real terms be 7 to 10 per cent lower than in 1974. A further drop is forecast

for 1976. So much for all that pre-entry propaganda about E.E.C. entry giving British industry an invigorating cold shower. It's been cold, but not demonstrably therapeutic."

"WORLD PRICES" EXCUSE

This decline of Britain's industrial power could have been predicted, not just by reference to the tariffs which applied in Britain against imports from the E.E.C., and the tariffs which applied in the E.E.C. against British exports prior to Britain joining the Common Market, but in reference to Britain's world-wide trading relationships prior to E.E.C. membership.

Prior to Britain joining the E.E.C. the Commonwealth Industries Association revealed that 68 per cent of our vital invisible earnings came from the Sterling Area, North America and the European Free Trade Association (E.F.T.A.), while only 14 per cent came from the original six E.E.C. countries.

Pro-E.E.C. propagandists are now trying to blame Britain's difficulties as a member of the Common Market on the recent great rises in the price of oil, of grain and other commodities which in the main have to be imported from outside the E.E.C. While it is certainly true that these world price rises have had a bad impact on Britain's balance of trade position, Britain's situation would still be bad even had those commodities remained at the price current prior to joining the E.E.C.

The reason for this lies at the very root of the way the Common Market arranges the industrial life of member nations. The ultimate ideal of the Eurocrats is to build the nations which comprise the E.E.C. into one single industrial and economic unit. To this end they have been working hard to "rationalise" and "harmonise" the industrial structures of member nations.

Fully independent nations obviously strive to build up a wide range of industrial and agricultural activity so that they can, so far as is possible, provide for themselves the things that they need not only to keep their own people employed and to save on their balance of payments position as a result of not needing to import so much, but also so as to provide a wide range of goods to export to the world.

The rules and regulations of the E.E.C. specifically and explicitly work to eliminate the possession by member nations of a comprehensive industrial and agricultural potential so that the E.E.C. as a whole can take on the comprehensive industrial and agricultural structure of a nation state. This is being achieved largely through the operations of the great multi-national companies — most of which are not even European owned, but are ultimately owned by the big time international banking organisations.

What is happening is that firms in Britain making a product such as, say, aircraft, are being linked with similar firms in Germany or France or Italy, and are being encouraged to jointly produce a single plane. The 'British' section of the operation will be required not to build the whole plane (as British technology is quite competent to do) but only, say, the engine. The French would be required to build the body-work, and the Germans the electronic systems. If this process of "rationalisation" is applied to all manner of industrial productions — as it is being, bit by bit — then large sections of British industry will inevitably have to close down. An industry originally structured to build whole aircraft, from the landing wheels upwards, and then directed only to producing engines, is inevitably going to employ less men, and inevitably going to earn less money.

But this is not the whole story. We have seen some multi-national companies deciding to close down the whole of their operation in Britain in order to concentrate production in the factories which they own in Europe.

Looked at from the point of view of non-British owned companies whose sole purpose is to make for their cosmopolitan owners profit on an international basis, this attitude is quite sensible. If the majority of the consumers in the Common Market are living on the European mainland, it is obviously more sensible to produce one's goods as near as possible to the consumers. Britain, *viz-a-viz* the Common Market, is after all, a peripheral area, an offshore-island.

It is just that kind of thinking which encouraged the American owned multi-national industrial conglomerate Litton Industries to close down its Imperial typewriter factories in Leicester and Hull, throwing 4,000 men out of work, and concentrating their European typewriter production operation on its factories in Germany. Thus there are now no longer any typewriters being built in Britain. We will have to import all the typewriters we need, thus placing an additional burden on our balance of payments.

WORST YET TO COME

The appalling effect this kind of development is having on our economy as Common Market "rationalisation" takes effect right across the board of British industry

is only just starting to be felt. We are far from having experienced the worst yet! This ugly trend must also be seen in human terms. As sophisticated industries steadily are uprooted from our country and are transferred to the Continent, then large numbers of very skilled British workers, if they desire to continue to apply their skills and training, will have to emigrate in order to find work.


We have already experienced a "brain drain" to the United States as a result of the run down of our defence industries during the 1950's and 60's. This will become a brain torrent as ever more of our most able workers, people key to our economic survival as a nation, flood into Europe, or go to the Commonwealth. Meanwhile, as we lose our best most productive people, we are 'topping up' our population with the surplus peasant population of Afro-Asia and Southern Europe whose role in our economic life is that of the helot.

E.E.C. rules and regulations governing "fair competition" between member nations also 'puts the boot in' to our prospects for industrial survival. For example, during the 1960's the British taxpayer spent countless millions to bring our steel industry

right up to date. The result of this investment was that prior to Britain joining the E.E.C. the British steel industry was able to produce steel at a cheaper rate than the steel industry in Europe.

One would have thought that efficiency would be rewarded . . . but not the E.E.C. "That's not fair", screamed the European steelmakers. The E.E.C. bureaucrats agreed, and as a result, Britain was obliged to sell her steel, not just in Europe but also in Britain, at the same price as European steelmakers! This rendered British steel uncompetitive, and forced up the prices of all goods manufactured from steel which are produced in Britain.

It is by reviewing these kinds of facts that we can see that the run-down of British industry and the general decline of Britain's economy since we have joined the Common Market was not "co-incidental with increases in the price of oil and grain". The run down has been deliberately planned and organised to eliminate Britain as a big industrial power, so as to eliminate any chance of independent nationhood. The Common Market is a political conspiracy against the British nation being carried out by economic and industrial subversion.



NORTH SEA OIL

A great British asset that the Eurocrats want to bring under their control

HOW E.E.C. MEMBERSHIP ERODES NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

EDWARD Heath told a whole bookful of lies to the British people when as Prime Minister he was dragging this country into Europe. When he came to power in 1970 we remember him saying, when he instigated membership negotiations with the European Economic Community, that the purpose of the negotiations was simply to "investigate terms of membership" and that he would not seek to secure British membership of the Community "without the fullhearted consent of Parliament and people".

But perhaps his most serious and brazen lie was his assertion that membership of the E.E.C. "would not involve Britain in any loss of essential national sovereignty". Mr. Heath did not attempt to define what constitutes "essential" national sovereignty, nor what might constitute non-essential national sovereignty, in his view.

What constitutes national sovereignty in all its aspects may be a matter for debate, but in the British context it is generally taken to mean the power which the people have to elect a Parliament which in turn has the power to pass and revoke laws whereby the nation is governed and administered; the power to impose taxes on the people of the nation in order to sustain the structures of the state; the power to spend tax revenue in the way that it decides is in the best interests of the nation; the power to establish and relinquish diplomatic and trading relationships with other sovereign states; and the power and duty to sustain an independent Judiciary whereby the Law is administered impartially.

All these essential and fundamental aspects of the sovereignty of the British people and their Parliament (and of our Monarch, who is the constitutional symbol of the unity and continuity of the people and the nation, and who stands as the ultimate protector of both in the face of the potential tyranny of politicians) are being or already have been undermined and destroyed by the laws, rules and regulations which govern Britain's membership of the Common Market.

Don't take my word for it — take the word of The Rt. Hon. Edward Short, P.C., M.P., leader of the House of Commons in the present Labour Administration, and an ardent pro-Common Market man. He told Parliament on 3rd December, 1974, in reference to protests from Members of the House of Commons concerning the impotence of the House over the vast mass of

Common Market dictates coming from Brussels which have immediate force of law in Britain:

BRITAIN SOLD SHORT

"... the basic difficulty is that Parliament has lost its sovereignty over this whole area of legislation which applies to the people of this country, and the most we can do is discuss these points."

Here is the proof of Edward Heath's shameless lie: as a member of the Common Market our once sovereign Parliament can only discuss but cannot change laws imposed on Britain by unelected foreign bureaucrats. In the E.E.C. our Parliament has become little more than a debating society. Questions asked by Members of Parliament or letters from constituents to their Members are a waste of time, because final decisions are no longer taken in this country.

The contempt which the Heath Administration and pro-Common Marketeers in the other parties had for Parliament and sovereignty was clear before even Britain became a member of the E.E.C. This alliance of traitors, bought men and fools voted to ratify the Treaty of Accession before the text of the treaty was published and before they had an opportunity to peruse ten volumes of treaties and 142 volumes of detailed rules and regulations which would have the force of law in Britain the moment the Treaty of Accession was signed!

Further contempt was exhibited by the way in which a vaguely-worded resolution accepting "the principle of the arrangements negotiated" was carried in the House of Commons by a 112 majority. Thereafter, during the debate of the Act which purported to give Heath the power to make Britain a member of the E.E.C., not one single amendment from the floor of either the House of Commons or the House of Lords was accepted by the Government.

We all know that the joining by Britain of the E.E.C. never achieved the "full-hearted consent of the British people", because they were never consulted. But here we see that the Act which empowered Heath to sign the Treaty of Accession most certainly did not achieve the "full-hearted consent of Parliament" either. As we know, numerous clauses of the Act were only carried by majorities of as small as ten or

less votes — and then only as a result of intense pressure and blackmail on individual M.P.'s by Whips constituency organisations and pro-Common Market Big Business concerns.

TREASONABLE ACT

Even though Heath did manage to bulldoze Parliament to accept the Act which empowered him to sign the Treaty of Accession, the Act in itself was illegal, unconstitutional and treasonable, and thus the Treaty itself should be considered null and void. The reason for this is that Parliament is sovereign and has the power not only to pass laws, but also to revoke or amend them — but Parliament does not have the power to revoke its powers to revoke or amend its decisions, or the power to surrender any other part of its sovereignty.

But the Treaty of Rome contains a clause which states that its "provisions are concluded for an indefinite period". Translated into plain English, that means that the Treaty asserts that its rules can never be changed and that once a nation has signed it and has become a member of the E.E.C., it can never withdraw." **Our Parliament just does not have the right to sign away the right of the members of Parliament in the future to revoke the Treaty of Accession.**

The range of issues which are now decided in the Common Market's Headquarters in Brussels and not by the elected representatives of the British people in Parliament constantly expand, and include:

- 1) Tariffs on most imported industrial goods and raw materials.

- 2) The producers' price of most foods — cereals, meat, dairy products, vegetables, etc.

- 3) The conditions governing the creation of cartels and monopolies.

- 4) Subsidies by national governments to firms, industries or regions.

- 5) The control of immigration into this country from any other Common Market country.

- 6) The power to control, audit or even comment effectively on ways in which the E.E.C. spends the money it extracts from the British taxpayer.

- 7) The right of Britain to conclude trade treaties with countries outside the E.E.C.

- 8) In due course, the right to determine the

level of Value Added Tax and tobacco duties; to be followed by control of indirect and possibly direct taxation.

9) The establishment of rules governing free competition, the free movement of labour, transportation, the establishment of businesses, and so forth.

At this stage it might be useful to explain what exactly are the Council of Ministers and the Commission. Pro-Common Market propaganda has it that the senior decision-making body is the Council of Ministers — that is, the committee of all the Foreign Ministers of all the member nations of the E.E.C. Pro-Common Market propaganda claims that the independence of each member nation is protected by the Council of Ministers as each Minister possesses a veto on any proposal brought before the body.

THE VETO FARCE

This power of veto is a farce, however, as the Council is not run along the lines of a democratic parliament — i.e. as a debating body. It is simply a negotiating body. Furthermore it can only negotiate on proposals brought before it by the Commission.


As it is the Commission which has the power to draw up the Agenda for the Council it is clear that the Commission has a greater degree of actual power than the Council. The Commission is made up of appointed E.E.C. officials who have to swear not to act in the interests of the nation of their birth when they take up E.E.C. office.

When these bureaucrats are drawing up the agenda for a meeting of the Council of Ministers and they want to push through a proposal which they know that one of the nations represented will object to, they tie in that proposal with another proposal which they know that nation cannot afford to reject, and in this way the E.E.C. bureaucrats effectively by-pass much-vaunted power of veto of members of the Council of Ministers.

Because of these fraudulent and undemocratic procedures, the Council of Ministers conducts its deliberations in secret. As a result of a decision taken at the E.E.C. Summit in December, 1974, still more secret decision-making meetings would be conducted at assemblies of the national Ambassadors to the Community.

At the same summit meeting it was announced that member nations of the E.E.C. found it "necessary to renounce the practice which consists of making agreements on all questions conditional on unanimous consent." The communiqué went on to state that "it has been expressly recommended giving more power to the Commission".

So much for the pro-Marketees' claim



TOWER OF BABEL

The sinister Headquarters building of the dictatorial EEC Commission in Brussels

that protection for the vital national interests of member nations is "built in" to the E.E.C.'s rules and structures. As we can see, the reverse is the case.

E.E.C. COURT POWERS

As important as the destruction of our Parliament's sovereign legislative ability is the destruction of the final power of British Courts to implement the law in Britain. Sitting in Luxembourg is the E.E.C. Court which can over-ride not only every other E.E.C. organ, but also the government, parliament and constitution of every member state.

A British judge when coming to a verdict has to try and decide on the meaning of the words of the law passed by Parliament. The E.E.C. Court judges have the freedom to decide for themselves, on whim, what they consider to be the intentions of the body which passed the law. This gives these judges, in effect, the power to make laws.

In a short article it is impossible to give a complete picture of how the Common Market steals power from Britain's Parliament, Courts and people. But there are enough facts to indicate that the theft of our sovereignty is taking place. The sovereignty, freedom, rights and liberties of the British people and their Parliament took hundreds of years and much blood to build up. By staying in the Common Market we are throwing away our birthright, our right to exist as a free self-governing people. We must get out of Europe.

E.E.C. NOT EUROPEAN

Self-styled Right Wing supporters of the Common Market, ranging from the supporters of Sir Oswald Mosley to the Monday Clubbers of the Tory Party, have tried to sell the Common Market to the British people as some kind of 'White Man's Club'.

This is nonsense. The Common Market means more immigrants for Britain, not less.

Under the terms negotiated by the Tory Government, and not in any way renegotiated under the present Government, special arrangements of favourable entry into Britain have been given to all coloured Commonwealth citizens.

But on top of this there are plenty of Afro-Asians living within the Common Market who are now able to migrate to Britain. There are at least one and a half million blacks and Algerians in France and about half a million Asians in Holland.

Southern Italians by the million will be able to migrate to Britain in the future, as they have migrated to the United States in such huge numbers, as well as to other parts of the E.E.C.

Turkey will be joining the Market in the 1990s, and by that time her population will be in the region of 50 million. Huge numbers of Turks have already migrated to other parts of the Common Market, particularly Germany. Any number of them will be able to come here.

THE drive towards union in Europe, as with the assault on the nation state all over the world, is defended, when every other argument has failed, by the claim that it is in the interests of peace. The nation, it is held, is an instrument of war. When national boundaries, are lowered, peace will prevail.

Neither the history of Europe nor of the world as a whole bear this theory out. Certainly, some wars have been the result of national conflicts, but far more have come about through completely different causes. There have been civil wars, religious wars, wars waged on behalf of political ideologies, wars fought to advance the claims of royal dynasties, wars for the furtherance of particular economic and financial interests — more often international than national. Not least, there have been wars fought over the very same issue as the Common Market today: the attempt to impose an all-European order on the sovereign nation states of Europe.

Since 1945 Europe has not known war, but the rest of the world has not been free from it. Of the three main conflicts that have occurred, the Middle Eastern war, the Korean war and the Vietnam war, only the first could be said to involve nationalistic factors.

In the biggest war to date in the history of the world, that of 1939-45, nationalistic factors were only a part of the cause, and indeed had the affair been limited to nationalistic issues it would have been confined to a small part of the area over which it eventually spread. It may be said that the principal reasons for the extent of the conflict were (a) Hitler's aim of building a European order, which violated many of Europe's oldest nation states, and (b) the determination of internationalist forces, representing liberalism, communism and various international financial interests, to destroy Hitler. Broadly speaking, the conflict was more than anything else one between two sets of opposite ideologies: Nazism and Fascism on the one hand, and Liberalism and Communism on the other. On both sides these ideologies transcended national boundaries, and in many instances men of the same nation fought on opposite sides in large numbers.

CIVIL WAR

Between the First and Second World Wars the greatest war in Europe was a civil war, the Spanish Civil War, fought on a smaller scale between the same sets of forces that contested World War II.

World War I could be quoted as another example of nationalistic factors interwoven with other factors not connected with nationalism. The spark that set Europe alight in 1914 came initially from the Balkans, where discontent had seethed for many decades. The discontent was not to any major extent due to national disputes


EURO-UNION AS A MEANS TO PEACE

HISTORY NOT ON THE SIDE OF THE UNIFIERS

between Balkan countries, but predominantly due to the hegemony over certain Balkan nations of the Hapsburg Empire, which was, like the Common Market concept embodied in the Treaty of Rome, an attempt to group diverse nations and races into a supra-national structure defined purely in terms of a unified geographical area.

Certainly, behind the policies of the four major participants, Britain, France, Russia and Germany, there were strong factors of national self-interest, but a deeper study of the war than is common in elementary history textbooks will reveal also that strong politico-financial undercurrents were

NAPOLÉON
He too saw himself
as the great unifier
of Europe.



in operation at the same time with the objective of bringing about revolutions in Germany and Russia and the consequent downfall of the Hohenzollern and Romanov monarchies with the aid of war.

Between the end of the Napoleonic wars and the onset of the First World War the biggest conflict in Europe was the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. This again was a war in which nationalist factors played a part but were interwoven with a dynastic issue, the claim of the Bonaparte House to the Spanish throne. The other war that caused the greatest death and destruction during this period took place in America, and that was a civil war.

As to the Napoleonic wars, these represented another case of conflict arising out of the attempt to create a European state in substitution to the traditional national states. The initial impulse behind the Napoleonic campaigns was provided by the forces of world revolution, which had just recently triumphed in France and which saw the opportunity to make use of the military genius of Napoleon in extending revolution over the whole of Europe. In time the personal power of Napoleon became paramount, but the motivation remained the same — a European order transcending nations.

The two major European wars during

the 18th Century, the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War, were conflicts in which the participants certainly seized the opportunity to advance their respective national ambitions, but these, as the name of the first suggests, were again largely dynastic affairs. Without the conflicting claims of the various Royal houses, it is doubtful that the peoples of the countries concerned would have gone to war. In the previous century the two main struggles were the Thirty Years War, which resulted in catastrophic loss of blood among the German peoples, and the War of the Spanish Succession. The latter was a dynastic dispute; the former a religious one involving reformation and counter-reformation in Germany.

OTHER CAUSES OF CONFLICT

Were space to permit, one could from these dates go back much further into a labyrinth of European wars, but it may briefly be stated — and anyone is welcome to confirm this by a closer study — that conflicts revolved almost entirely around dynastic or religious issues; the claims of monarchs to various thrones, wars of Protestant against Catholic or Catholic against Heathen, until we get back to the wars of the Romans, which bring us again to the concept of a supra-national order extending across Europe.

The summary of all this may be that where national factors are not present to cause conflict in Europe or elsewhere in the world other factors will be, and as a rule are to a much greater extent. The world has not been a more peaceful place in the ages when national states were not predominant than in the times when they are.

The conflicts of yesteryear between religions can be said to have been replaced today by conflicts between political ideologies, while those arising from the power-lust of kings have been replaced by those arising from the power-lust of the enormous supra-national financial and business interests. Instead of the claims of royal dynasties to thrones, we now have the claims of commercial dynasties to territories containing great mineral wealth, the best modern example of this being the terrible slaughter in the Congo brought about by the conflict between different business cartels for the minerals of Katanga.

EUROPEAN UNION is frequently described as essential to the defence of Britain in so far as it is supposed to give the European nations the strength to resist a Soviet attack. How true is this assertion?

The fact is that if a conventional attack took place from behind the Iron Curtain the forces of the Western European nations, whether fighting separately or as one, would be overwhelmed. It is acknowledged by all leading military minds of today that the only effective deterrent to such an attack is nuclear.

European nations pooling their resources in the development and manufacture of nuclear weapons could certainly produce a greater quantity of nuclear power together than any single nation could do separately, but quantity is in fact not the essence of the nuclear deterrent. A deterrent is effective if it persuades the would-be aggressor that at least his ten or twenty major cities and industrial centres would be destroyed if he started a war. Even if he had the power to destroy more in return, the loss to him simply wouldn't be worthwhile.

British science and industry is quite capable on its own of producing, if not as large a nuclear force as America or Russia, at least sufficient a force to provide a deterrent of such a nature. What is much more important than the size of the deterrent is the ability to use it quickly. A British Government is far more likely to be able to do this than a European assembly.

Quite apart from this, defence policy is utterly ridiculous if it considers a Soviet attack on Western Europe as the only contingency of war that could occur. It is just one of the possible contingencies of the future in which Britain might be involved.

Drastic changes in the political status of countries either side of the Iron Curtain could entirely alter the current line up of forces. Just as one example, either Italy or France could go Communist within the next ten or twenty years. These countries are major elements in the European system. If they fell, where would that system be?

CHANGING DIVISION OF WORLD

If we use the present apparent division of the world as the basis for devising political boundaries for the future, it would have been right to assume in the 1930s — when Europe was divided between Fascist and non-Fascist powers — that all the latter should amalgamate into one to defend their existence against the former. Had this principle been followed, we would today have some very queer fellow countrymen!

Of course, the alignment against Fascism was based, as it was bound to be, on the belief that it was the correct alignment at that time, and to meet that contingency. It was an alliance between powers which had just for the moment a common objec-

THE DEFENCE ISSUE

Nonsense of the Euro-Strategists

AN AIRCRAFT THEY SHOULD HAVE KEPT

The TSR2 (right) years ahead of its time, was scrapped by the previous Labour government when ex-Communist Dennis Healey was Minister of Defence. This great British plane was sacrificed on the altar of internationalism. It has never been properly replaced.



tive, and that is indeed the only basis on which military alliances can be made.

If we ponder for a moment on how the division of the world has altered over the past half-century, we may be able to consider soberly how much it could change over the next half-century, throwing into complete shambles all our present assumptions about collective security.

Existing political alignments with foreign powers are never eternal; only national interests are eternal. The only viable policy for national defence is one based on national strength — augmented by whatever foreign alliances suit the moment. Such alliances are a supplement to one's own strength; they can never be a substitute for it.

And even if Russia is the most likely enemy today, it is by no means likely that she will attack us through Europe. Lenin said that the Western nations would best be undermined by getting at them at their peripheries — that is the network of overseas colonies, dominions and spheres of economic interest by which countries such as Britain, France and their neighbours have been sustained. This policy is far more profitable to the Kremlin. It obviates the risk of a

world war, and it does not require the sacrifice of Russian lives. It is also the policy that has been applied with so much success since 1945.

Facing the many contingencies of war that the next half-century may bring, we will only be safe in relying on our own national strength and then negotiating alliances from the basis of that strength according to the nature of the contingency in question and what nations, if any, it brings into natural alignment with us.

The wholesale integration of our forces within a West European defence strategy would be suicidal from this point of view, as it would leave us with neither the freedom nor the capacity to act in defence of vital British interests elsewhere in the world.

It is claimed that our present policy should be based on the fact that we are not big enough alone to successfully wage war against one of the super-powers. What is more to the point is that alone we can possess a nuclear deterrent which would make no attack by a super power worthwhile, and that alone we are able to wage conventional war, if required, to defend our interests against any of the middle-sized or smaller powers.

HOW BRITAIN WAS RAILROADED INTO EUROPE

TO a great many politically aware people in Britain the manner in which our country was inveigled into the E.E.C. had about it the whiff of conspiracy. Edward Heath, anticipating a distinct lack of public enthusiasm for the project, said in his manifesto for the Election of 1970 that Britain would not be taken into Europe "without the full-hearted consent of Parliament and people." The consent of Parliament, when it was obtained, was nothing like full-hearted, and as for that of the people, there was never any attempt, or indeed the intention of such an attempt, to obtain this at all.

This process was nothing new; it was consistent with the whole historical build-up that had gone before. The conspiracy to drag Britain into the Common Market has always been merely a part of a wider and deeper conspiracy to destroy the nation states of the world and subject them to international super government. In this conspiracy Money Power can be seen to have played the dominant role. The international banking fraternity has always been hostile to national sovereignty, and in the 20th Century it has used its massive influence always in the service of bigger and bigger groupings of international power.

When the British Commonwealth and Empire was engaged in armed struggle in three continents during the last World War, its disintegration was already being planned by the lords of high finance and internationalism. A strong and united Commonwealth of British nations was likely to provide the principal obstacle to the movement towards world government which was intended to sweep all before it after the war. Therefore the Commonwealth had at all costs to be destroyed. This destruction was pursued as a matter of policy in the most senior circles of international finance, while at the same time the fiction was encouraged that the break-up of the Commonwealth was some kind of 'inevitable' process resulting from the maturity of its members to 'nationhood'. The very people who were bent on destroying nationhood the world over were not above using their own phony concept of nationhood in pursuit of that purpose.

In both Lend Lease and the Marshall plan there were clauses directed against the Imperial Preference system of trade, General Marshall taking with him to the Quebec Conference of 1943 the brief that the

biggest single obstacle to the expansion of 'American' export capitalism after the war would not be the Soviet Union but the British Empire! Already at the Atlantic Charter meeting of 1941 (before America had entered the war) Roosevelt when conferring with Churchill about the shape of the post-war world had hinted at the elimination of Imperial Preferences and invited from Churchill the remark: Mr. President, I believe you are trying to do away with the British Empire. Every idea that you entertain of the structure of the post-war world demonstrates it."

The view of Churchill about US policy was confirmed immediately the war ended and the foreign ministers of the allied nations met in London to map out the future. At this meeting the Lords of 'American' High Finance had their own representative present, Bernard Baruch, thought by many to be the most powerful man in the world at that time. Asked what he was doing at a conference of foreign ministers, Baruch replied: "I've come to hold the big stick over the big boys to make damn sure they don't foul up the peace." Shortly afterwards Baruch told a newspaper correspondent: "If the British want to keep their Imperial Preferences, we'll let them — for four years."

Almost simultaneous to this meeting was the abrupt termination of Lend-Lease to Britain. This had the immediate effect of forcing the British government to borrow over £1,000 million from the Transatlantic money complex on whose behalf Baruch had stated his intentions. The strings attached to this loan included the provision that Britain should be pledged in advance to the terms of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). GATT's purpose was to obtain a progressive 'liberalising' of trade throughout the world — which ran directly contrary to the principle of Imperial and Commonwealth Preference. The effect of GATT was to systematically weaken the ties binding the British nations, and to open up Canada and Australia in particular to 'American' commercial penetration.

START OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

At the same time as Transatlantic influences were furthering the disintegration of the British Commonwealth, they had started to set the wheels in motion towards

an integrated Europe. The European Payments Union was created upon the insistence of Wall Street. The European Coal and Steel Authority was conceived in the United States by David Lilienthal, one of the very top figures in the International Financial hierarchy, Euratom was the idea of none other than Bernard Baruch himself.

Influences from across the Atlantic were equally active in destroying the traditional status-quo in Africa. The author Douglas Reed, who since the war, has lived in that continent, says in his book *The Battle for Rhodesia*: "I first realized in 1949 that America was to become involved in Africa . . . In the following years a whole crop of nominally private bodies sprang up in Washington around the Africa programme. They proliferated like toadstools after rain, and like the gentle rain from heaven much monies dropped on them from the Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford Foundations . . . If any doubt remained about American intentions towards Africa it was removed in the 1960s when President Kennedy appointed a Mr. Mennen Williams Assistant Secretary for African Affairs and sent him to Africa . . . Mr. Williams expressed open hostility to the governments of Southern Africa . . . America was deeply involved in the African turmoil, which . . . enveloped all northern Africa."

SUBVERSIONS OF DOMINIONS

The subversion of Canada was of course an 'American' priority from the start. In the 1950s Canadian newspapers started to uncover transactions in which large funds from American business had been supplied to the two major Canadian political parties, whose leaders, Messrs. Pearson and Diefenbaker, had done everything possible to further American penetration into Canada and the weakening of ties with Britain.

Some time later Mr. Neil McElroy, US Secretary of Defence in the Eisenhower Cabinet, addressed the Canadian Board of Trade on the urgent need for a US-Canadian union.

At the Commonwealth Economic Conference at Montreal in 1958 the shadow of the United States fell over every stage of the negotiations, and particularly where Canada was concerned. A report from Washington in the Vancouver *Province* at that time said: "American officials . . . make no bones about the fact in private that the US would consider the continuation of Commonwealth preferences intolerable." The report went on to speak of Canada's fears of serious injury to her economy if preferred entry into the United Kingdom was lost. It added: "Such loss would come as a windfall to US exports unless Canada and other Commonwealth countries can obtain concessions from the US in return for its improved access into their markets."

In the meantime the drive to separate Australia and New Zealand from the British

orbit was well in progress. America forged the ANZUS Pact, under which Australia and New Zealand (but not Britain) joined with the United States in defending the Antipodes. American-based finance penetrated ever deeper into the economy in particular of Australia.

PUSHING BRITAIN INTO EUROPE

As fast as American pressures have been working to break up the unity of the British Commonwealth, pressures of the same kind have been working towards the unity of Europe and in particular towards British submersion in that unity. Reference has been made to the Marshall Plan, which gave 'American' financial interests the ideal leverage with which to dictate the policies of those in receipt of it. Marshall Aid in particular was made a condition of Britain's increasing orientation towards the European Continent.

This fact was spelled out by none other than Bernard Baruch himself when speaking to the United Europe Movement in London in 1950 he said: "Americans such as I heartily approve the efforts that the United Europe Movement is putting forth, and wish it success . . . Unless the peoples of Europe unite and quickly give their full all-out support to General Eisenhower in his efforts to bring about a common defence, you cannot count on America's economic and military aid continuing."

President Kennedy's policy with regard to Europe was made quite clear by his Special Assistant, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, in a speech in Chicago on the 6th December 1961. Referring to "the political problem of separate Western European sovereign states", he spoke of America's purpose, "the political unity of Western Europe". "The steps towards European unity which have occurred since 1947," he said, "are neither few nor trifling, and each of them has depended in large measure upon the sympathy and even the support of the Government of the United States. It will be this way in the future too."

This certainly reflected the attitude of the US State Department, which was shortly before reported by the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent as follows:—

"Strongly supporting the Common Market, the State Department has been telling businessmen that this was a worthwhile political goal, the unification of Europe."

"Sympathy" and "support" are comparatively mild words. That American policy went well beyond such things was indicated by a report in the *Daily Mail* in May 1961. The report said that the Cabinet had decided to take the revolutionary step of joining the Common Market, and named three principal factors as having influenced the decision. The first of these was: "Pressure from President Kennedy."

TRAVELLING AGENT

It is opportune at this point to examine the role of a man who for the last decade or so has served as travelling agent, promotor and contact man for the United States Government in its task of bringing about the integration of Europe. He is George Ball.

At the beginning of 1961 *The Daily Express* reported:

"A top US legal adviser on the European Common Market was today (January 11th) named by President-elect John Kennedy as his expert on international economic affairs. He is fifty-one-year-old international lawyer George W. Ball, close friend of Adlai Stevenson. His new job: Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs."

"Now Washington observers are wondering whether Ball's new job indicates a big new American drive to speed up integration of the six members of the European Common Market and the Outer Seven, to which Britain belongs."

Ball's activities throughout 1961 are not completely on record, but at the end of that year *The New York Times* was able to say of him that he "had a great deal to do with the decision by Britain to seek membership in the European Common Market."

A little later *The Daily Express* gave a few interesting facts on Mr. Ball. It revealed that Ball's law firm in Washington represented Euratom, the European Coal and Steel Community and the Common Market. It said that Ball's dedicated life's work was the establishment of a Common Market throughout all Europe (!!!) and another free trade area centred around America covering the rest of the 'free world'. The *Express* said: "If one man's will-power and belief were enough, Britain would already be in the Common Market, and Australia and Canada would probably be part of an economic unit with America and Japan."

Except to say that the "will-power" was certainly not that of Ball himself but of much more powerful men behind the scenes, we could state that this report summarises the whole strategy behind the American efforts to get Britain into Europe.

Coming forward now to much more recent times, we may recall the impasse thought to have been reached at the end of 1970 in which it was believed that President Pompidou's Government was getting a little obstructive over the matter of British entry into the Common Market. Promptly Mr. Ball dispatched himself to Paris and went into a huddle with senior French Government officials. He soon emerged and flew over to see Mr. Heath, telling him that as a result of the talks the Pompidou Cabinet now unanimously supported British entry into the EEC and then urging him to launch a massive propa-

ganda campaign to convert British public opinion to the "absolute necessity" of going into Europe. The latter instruction was obediently carried out.

Ball's recent rôle was described in the report of an interview with him by Jeremy Campbell of the *Evening Standard*:

"Ball is now a private citizen practising international finance from an office in Wall Street. He travels frequently across the Atlantic and keeps closely in touch with Government leaders in Europe. At the same time he is often consulted, in a suitably discreet manner, by Henry Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's reigning foreign policy adviser and a man of enormous influence in the White House."

THE MONEY POWER STATES ITS AIMS

As to the aims of these international financial interests whom Ball represents, a good guide was recently supplied by Mr. Judd Polk of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce in the American magazine *Saturday Review*, Writing on the theme "The Rise of World Corporations", Mr. Polk said:

"New bases of production are being established throughout the world by multinational or international companies which have come to regard the world as one great market. More than \$400,000 million worth of goods are being produced under international investment, and this sector has been growing about twice as fast as the gross national product of the world."

"If this growth rate continues, the world economy will be more than half internationalised by the end of the century. This international production is not just an external linking of economies; it is a bonding process that has forged a world economy, incipient still, but growing rapidly and probably irrevocably . . ."

"United States investment abroad has grown from \$32,000 million in 1950 to about \$146,000 million in 1969. In Europe United States direct investment has grown by an average annual rate of about 15 per cent . . ."

"The ultimate health of the international company and the world economy depends on the degree to which we see the world as an international economy instead of a group of national economies."

In these words we may perceive the whole essence of internationalism, of which a united Europe is just a part. Behind all the idealistic cant about 'peace' and 'brotherhood', there lies the grasping, rapacious drive to monopoly of International Big Business. Today Big Business, through financial patronage, controls all the major political parties in Britain, as well as the newspapers. This is why these vast institutions have managed to ride roughshod over public opposition in railroading Britain into the Common Market.

NO ARGUMENT is needed to prove the immense economic potential that lies within the British Commonwealth. Either Australia or Canada, taken singly, can be considered to represent storehouses of natural resources on the scale of the United States — with the difference that their exploitation has only just begun.

The raw material wealth of Australia is quite staggering. Enormous reserves of coal, iron, zinc, lead, copper, bauxite, gold, nickel, manganese, natural gas and uranium lie beneath the ground of this huge land mass.

Canada also has most of these minerals in similar abundance, and in addition has endless forests able to supply timber. Her nickel reserves are easily the biggest in the world.

On the agricultural front, both these countries are massive food suppliers. Australia is among the world leaders in meat products, while Canada supplies an enormous portion of the world's wheat. Add to these the superb dairy industry of New Zealand and the wool producing capacity of both countries of the Australasian continent and one has a potential for wealth and economic power greater than that of any other political grouping in the world, the U.S.A. and Russia included.

Unlike the countries of Europe, these Commonwealth countries are natural trading partners of Britain. Their economies are complementary to ours. They supply in abundance the products that we need and provide a splendid and growing market for the products in which our own industry specialises.


Of course Australia, Canada and New Zealand, particularly the first two, are no longer content to remain merely primary producing areas; in recent decades they have been intent on fostering their own native manufacturing industries and must be expected to give their own manufactured products preference over those from overseas, even including those from Britain.

LION'S SHARE

But so long as these countries rely for their prosperity on a massive export trade in primary products — and that is likely to be for centuries to come — they are going to have to find some way of spending the huge overseas currency earnings that derive from these exports. If British industry regains its competitiveness — and if it doesn't it isn't going to prosper in any economic area — it has a better chance than any of grabbing the lion's share of the Commonwealth market. In both Australia and New Zealand people of British stock make up easily the bulk of the populations. In Canada they are still by far the largest single ethnic group. In all these

THE ALTERNATIVE

Rebuild the Commonwealth



countries, apart from the Canadian province of Quebec, the English language prevails and gives us the edge in both sales and servicing of goods over exporters like Germany, Japan, Italy and France.

Australia, New Zealand and Canada are countries still in the infancy of their development. Their populations are likely to multiply several times over the next century or so, with the potential populations of Australia and Canada running into the hundreds of millions. This is in contrast to the countries of Europe, most of which are near to the optimum population they are capable of supporting. The Commonwealth countries are going to grow and grow in the future, and this means their economies are going to grow accordingly — providing the basis for an increasing two-way trade with Britain.

As mentioned at the beginning, these facts do not even need arguing; they are known and accepted by all shades of political and economic opinion alike. What is argued — and this provides the entire substance of

the case for Europe in preference to the Commonwealth — is that the Commonwealth countries do not now wish to maintain any special preferences for trade with Britain but want to go their own way in the world, becoming increasingly estranged from Britain with each passing generation.

This argument is in fact a perversion of the truth.

OTTAWA CONFERENCE

The truth has always been that Commonwealth estrangement from Britain has its origins in United Kingdom policy rather than in the policies of the Commonwealth countries. Seldom throughout the last century has any United Kingdom government made any serious attempt to build a lasting trade relationship with the countries of the British world. The bravest of such attempts was in 1932 at the Ottawa

Imperial Conference, when it was resolved to maintain preferences. It was not long, however, before the British Government, under pressure from International Finance, allowed these preferences to be whittled away. In our previous article *How Britain was rail-roaded into Europe* we have described how some of these pressures were applied.

"FREE TRADE"

Of older occurrence is the tendency of 'free trade' forces to dominate British political thinking, and the political parties, in Britain. The Liberals, one of the two leading parties until just after World War I, were always free-traders and internationalists by philosophy, long after all the economic facts of the world had rendered their doctrine out of date. The Tories have gradually adopted economic liberalism under the pressure of the great city interests that have come to dominate their party with the decline in the power of the old landed gentry. Labour, as the successor in internationalism to the Liberals, has always since it entered the arena of political power in Britain eschewed any policy of self-containment through Commonwealth and Empire.

Many times the Commonwealth countries, both from pro-British sentiment and from the standpoint of their own self-interest, have taken the initiative in seeking closer trading relations with the United Kingdom. Only when it was quite clear that Britain was committed utterly to betraying her Commonwealth partners and going into Europe did those old partners begin to develop separatist policies. They were left with no alternative.

COMMONWEALTH'S VIEWS

In April 1946 New Zealand Finance Minister Walter Nash said: "We are tremendously keen on maintaining Preference — our hold on Preference might be even stronger than Great Britain's. At about the same time Field Marshal Smuts expressed similar views on behalf of South Africa, and Canada's Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. J. MacKinnon, said: "Canada will not abandon Imperial Trade Preference. The loss of trade with Britain will seriously damage Canada's whole trade structure."

In the late 1950s Australia and New Zealand were still putting great pressure on Britain to buy more of their primary produce but Britain was bent on resisting this pressure because already she was becoming deeply enmeshed with Europe through E.F.T.A., the European Free Trade Area.

Quite recently the Prime Ministers of New Zealand and Canada have visited Britain expressing concern that the Common

Market was jeopardising their trade with the United Kingdom and New Zealand Premier, Mr. Wallace Rowling, at this very late hour was pleading with Britain to keep her market open for his country's dairy products and saying that he wished we would withdraw from the E.E.C.

WHITLAM'S VIEWS

The pro-Marketeers have made such propaganda out of the fact that Australian Premier Gough Whitlam has stated his support for Britain remaining in Europe, but Mr. Whitlam will not be in office for ever. He is notoriously anti-British and has lately been fast losing support in his own country.

Despite what the Marketeers say, most Commonwealth food exports are still available to us at cheaper prices than those of the Common Market. Australia recently offered us a vastly better sugar deal than was offered by Europe. Butter, cheese and lamb from Australasia are still cheaper than from E.E.C. countries — despite the levy on them required by Community regulations.

Britain's refusal to commit herself solidly to support of the Commonwealth, despite the instant support of herself by the Commonwealth in two World Wars, has naturally made for a weakening of pro-British sentiment in the countries concerned. Britain has in addition alienated South Africa and Rhodesia from the Commonwealth completely, less through economic factors than by our support for Black rule in those countries.

Nevertheless, if Britain left the Common Market tomorrow there would still be the basis for a massive trade with all these countries. They have primary products that they want to sell and which we want to buy. They cannot eat the Pounds Stirling that we pay them for those products. They must spend them on imports. We can supply those imports immediately we get our industries in order.

RESTORING THE OLD LINKS

In the longer term we can restore the older Commonwealth links of sentiment that will make for greater trade — if we are determined to do so. It will need from us a wholehearted commitment towards our kith and kin overseas extending many years ahead and not expecting an immediate commitment from them in return. We were prepared to make this commitment towards Europe long in advance of Europe admitting us as a member. There is no reason why we should not do the same with those much closer to us in race, language, culture, tradition and historical connection.

And if it be argued that present Commonwealth trends are towards

estrangement from Britain rather than a coming closer to Britain it might be replied that up to 1945 the countries of the E.E.C. were not only estranged from each other but actually **fighting** each other. Yet only 13 years later six of them had entered into an economic union!

In its pamphlet *Britain: world power or pauper state?* the National Front has outlined in detail how a powerful and united Commonwealth system might be built which would meet British needs in the future. First, as has been mentioned, there must be a firm and lasting commitment on Britain's part to a Commonwealth policy. There must not be, as is favoured by many anti-Marketeers, a reversion to the feeble and discredited doctrine of international free trade.

Secondly, Britain must not exhaust herself in trying to maintain the old colonial relationship with the many coloured nations of the Commonwealth. These for the most part should be allowed to go their own way and prove themselves capable of the independence they are always shouting that they have won from us. Our commitment must be almost solely to the White, and predominantly British, races, which in total number, with the population of the United Kingdom, almost 100 millions — the basis of a great power by any standards.


WHITE LEADERSHIP

As part of this the National Front advocates that every effort be made to encourage South Africa and Rhodesia back into the Commonwealth by our giving wholehearted support to the maintenance of White leadership in those countries.

Parallel with an economic and diplomatic campaign to regain confidence in the Commonwealth, there must be a sustained effort to influence public opinion in the countries that we want as partners. This can be done by building alliances with political parties most favourable to the British connection and obtaining, through investment, a powerful voice in the press. In view of the role of the Beaverbrooks, Thomsons and Murdochs in the press of the United Kingdom, this would, after all, be no more than a reciprocal process.

One final thing must be said: our ability to regain our old relationship with the White British Commonwealth rests above all on our ability to regenerate the United Kingdom itself and thereby to offer our would-be partners the alliance of a resurgent, thriving and dynamic power. This is vital if our economic partnership is to be of profit to them; it is vital if their people are to be infused once again with pride in their British heritage.

Without such a regeneration, we are not only bound to fail in the Commonwealth, we are bound to fail everywhere.



GREAT ANTI-MARKET PIONEER

A.K. CHESTERTON (pictured left) is the man to whom, more than anyone else, we owe our knowledge and understanding of the evils of the Common Market.

Mr. Chesterton was one of the very early pioneers of the anti-Common Market cause in Britain, becoming a dedicated fighter against the Market from the moment it first became an issue in this country in the late 1950s.

In his newsletter *Candour* he ceaselessly exposed the manoeuvres to embroil Britain in the E.E.C., as he did all manoeuvres to destroy British national sovereignty and the bonds of the British Commonwealth. He was aware of the dangers of the Common Market, and spoke and wrote about them forthrightly, long before any of the present prominent anti-Marketeters were ever heard on the issue.

Mr. Chesterton was the founder and first Chairman of the National Front. It was his leadership above all that got the NF off the ground in its early years and provided it with the policy foundations upon which it fights today.

After leaving the NF at the end of 1970 he continued his writings until his death in 1973.

Who's jumping on whose bandwaggon?

Mr. Harold Fieldman, writing in *Resistance News*, organ of the Common Market Safeguards Campaign in January of this year, said in an article summoning anti-Marketeters to the referendum battle: "Be especially careful of extreme parties of the right or left whose tactics are normally to jump on any popular bandwaggon and claim it for their own."

Though he did not exactly say it, it is quite clear that when Mr. Fieldman was speaking of "extreme parties of the right" he had in mind the National Front. It would be interesting therefore to examine the substance of his statement about jumping on the bandwaggon.

The Common Market Safeguards Campaign was founded in 1970 and *Resistance News* started publication in 1972, whereas the National Front was formed in 1966. Prior to the formation of the NF most of its founders had been active in a number of smaller political groups, which amalgamated together under the NF umbrella. One of these was the British National Party, which had been in existence since 1960 and had been opposed to the Common Market from its earliest beginnings. Another was the League of Empire Loyalists, which had been active since the middle 1950s fighting against any British entanglement in Europe. Another component part of the NF was the Greater Britain Movement, which had been anti-E.E.C. since its foundation in 1964.

Many of the leading political personalities whom *Resistance News* regularly publicises have not exactly been distinguished by long and consistent records of opposition to the Common Market. Peter Shore, anti-Marketeteer prominent in the headlines these days, was unknown in that capacity up till three or four years ago. Enoch

Powell, whose anti-Market speeches *Resistance News* regularly reports, was converted to the cause some time in 1969, after formerly having been a staunch Europe man.

In contrast, the founder and first Chairman of the National Front, A.K. Chesterton, was a campaigner against the E.E.C. since it first became a political issue in Britain. As long ago as 1961, directly it was announced that Britain had made the decision to apply for membership, he wrote in *Candour* newsletter an article entitled "Betrayal: What joining the Common Market would mean" in which he said: "Is there a fool anywhere who believes that a national economy can be replaced by an international economy and yet leave the nation intact and free?"

John Tyndall, current Deputy Chairman of the National Front and Editor of *Spearhead*, wrote in our leader column in April 1965: "Gradually . . . the Common Market issue creeps back into British politics. The fact is rightly deplored . . . Europe . . . lacks racial unity. It lacks raw materials . . . In it we would cease to be a nation, but would become just a state. The prospect of being the 7th state of Europe has no more attraction to the British than being the 51st state of America . . . Let us stay with the Commonwealth . . . Let the Commonwealth be our bloc."

Long before that date Mr. Tyndall had been campaigning against the Common Market. The same is true of Martin Webster, John Bean, the late Frank Clifford and many other NF leaders.

Mr. Fieldman may indeed be right when he says that there has been some jumping on the bandwaggon, but his vision of who it is seems, to say the least, to be a little blurred.

This Issue

This issue of *Spearhead* is a special one devoted entirely to the European Common Market. It is published with the object of assisting all those engaged in the current campaign to get Britain out of the Market leading up to the coming referendum.

Among political organisations opposing the Common Market, *Spearhead* has especially close ties with the National Front, and this issue is mainly intended to assist the work of that organisation in opposing the Common Market.

However, the content of this issue should be of interest to all people and organisations fighting the anti-Market battle, in so far as it provides a wealth of facts, figures and arguments which go to substantiate the anti-Market case.

The date of publication has been deliberately omitted from the front cover so as to facilitate sales at all times.

We hope that all National Front branches and groups will make a special effort to sell this issue, purchasing extra copies as part of their anti-Market campaign. We hope that other individuals and bodies will do the same.

Details of bulk rates can be obtained on page 19. Postal rates should be estimated on the basis of a weight of app. 2 oz. per copy.

Organised groups should of course be able to purchase supplies at the top discount rates. However, even if you are just one individual on your own, perhaps with the addition of your wife, how about a patriotic-gesture of buying 50 copies for £4.50 with 47p extra for postage, then distributing them around your locality. If enough people do this, what an enormous contribution to the anti-Market cause this will be!

Read Britain First

Read *Britain First*, published in support of the National Front. Monthly. Six pages. Newspaper-style. Subscription for 12 issues: £2. Reduced rates for bulk supplies given on request. Send 10½p for sample copy now.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

Role of National Front in Anti-EEC Campaign

THE NATIONAL FRONT, with 90 candidates standing in different parts of the country, was the fourth largest party fighting the last General Election, and the only all-British party in that election opposed to the Common Market.

Since its foundation in 1966 the National Front has consistently been against British membership of the E.E.C., and in fact many of its leaders have been in the fight against the E.E.C. for much longer.

The National Front has distributed millions of leaflets all over Britain against Britain joining Europe, and, subsequent to our joining, in favour of withdrawal from Europe. It has also held many spectacular marches and public demonstrations on the issue (see picture on right).

Last November more than 5,000 N.F. supporters marched through London to a meeting at Lincoln's Inn Fields at which speeches were made condemning, among other things, Britain's sell-out to Europe.

On all these marches the Commonwealth theme has been championed, with Commonwealth flags borne by the marchers alongside huge numbers of Union Jacks.

No other organisations opposing the Common Market have mounted public demonstrations anything near the size of those of the N.F.

At a large demonstration held at Covent Garden in January 1973 against the 'Fanfare for Europe' festival organised by the Government the N.F. provided about 300 of the 400 people present representing various anti-Market groups. On another occasion several anti-Market groups collaborated in holding a torchlight march through London. This was in January 1974. Again, about three-quarters of the 1,500 or so people on the march were supplied by the National Front.

The N.F. has always been more than willing to collaborate with all other anti-Market organisations, regardless of its differences with them over other issues. Unhappily, many of the other anti-Market groups have not shown the same spirit of collaboration with the N.F.

Whatever the result of the referendum, the N.F. anti-Market fight will go on.



Anti-Market posters

Anti-Common Market posters are now available from National Front Headquarters bearing the same design theme as the cover of this issue of *Spearhead*. They contain the same words, with the addition of the name and address of the NF. The posters measure 17 in. by 22 in.

Price: 2p

Order your supply now from:
50 Pawns Road, Croydon, CR0 2QF.

Recommended Reading

Much literature is available from Nationalist Books, the National Front bookshop, on the subject of the Common Market, why Britain should get out, and what alternatives are available. Particularly recommended are:—

THE COMMON MARKET: WHY BRITAIN
MUST GET OUT (NF pamphlet) 20p
BRITAIN: WORLD POWER OR PAUPER STATE
(NF pamphlet) 20p
THE CASE FOR ECONOMIC NATIONALISM
(NF pamphlet) 10p
ALTERNATIVE TO THE COMMON MARKET
(booklet by Frank Clifford) 15p
COMMON MARKET SUICIDE
(booklet by A. K. Chesterton) 25p
THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS
(book by A. K. Chesterton) £1
Sundry anti-Common Market leaflets published by
the National Front £1.25 per 1,000

These prices do not include postage charges, which must be added on. Precise information on these will be supplied on enquiry.

Nationalist Books, 50 Pawns Road, Croydon, CR0 2QF (Tel. 01-684 3730)

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):

British Isles:	£2.46.
Overseas surface mail:	£2.40 unsealed
	£3.60 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£4.14 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
(unsealed)	Africa, Middle East
	£4.62 Australia, New Zealand,
	Far East

Discounts can be obtained
for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies:	30 per-cent
50—99 copies:	40 per-cent
100—249 copies:	50 per-cent
250 copies and over:	60 per-cent

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 50 Pawns Road, Croydon, CR0 2QF, Surrey. If receipt is required, please enclose S.A.E.

Europe: getting out is not enough

GETTING BRITAIN OUT of the Common Market is an immediate priority, and all organisations and individuals that give their help to this cause are to be welcomed. In this matter we who support the National Front are much more broad-minded than some anti-Marketeers. While they would prefer to reduce the strength of the campaign against the Market rather than collaborate with the National Front, we are quite willing to work with them, since to us every ally in the anti-Market cause is valuable. This includes people whose politics are undeniably left-wing. We detest their other political philosophies as much as they detest ours, but to us at the moment fighting the Common Market is more important than fighting them.

However, it is still right that we should look beyond the mere question of getting out of the E.E.C. That may or may not be achieved in the near future. What is important is that we have a cogent and realistic plan for British survival outside Europe.

This is where the difference between ourselves and other anti-Marketeers stands out strongly. They want to get out of Europe merely to go back to the old slovenly, aimless path that Britain was pursuing for a century up to 1973. We want to take a dynamic new road for Britain.

To hear them talk, one would think that all our troubles began when Britain signed the Treaty of Rome, and that before that everything in this country was fine. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What in fact do most of them offer if we get out of Europe? Nothing more than a reversion to the outdated and discredited internationalist free-trade policy that Britain followed for most of the period leading from

the Industrial Revolution — a policy which had made us industrially feeble long before we entered the Common Market.

Indeed the objection of some anti-Marketeers is that the European Community, far from being too internationalist, is not internationalist enough! Listen to the words of Neil Marten, perhaps the most prominent anti-Marketeer in the Tory Party. In his booklet *The Common Market: No middle way*, published and distributed by the Common Market Safeguards Campaign, he says: "British thinking needs to get away from the somewhat claustrophobic and parochial conception of a little Europe. It needs to think in terms of the general civilisation we want to defend and encourage. It should aim to work on the broadest possible front of co-operation in trade, aid, finance, energy, defence and politics with the maximum number of broadly like-minded countries..."

Much the same song is sung by the Anti-Common Market League, which works closely with the Common Market Safeguards Campaign. In a recent leaflet it said: "The better alternative is for Britain to... co-operate in international affairs with the United Nations, the Commonwealth, N.A.T.O., the World Bank and all the other international bodies of which Britain is a member..."

INTERNATIONALIST APPROACH

In the same way as these people want to preserve the old internationalist approach to world affairs that has done so much to undermine British global strength and power, so do they want nothing more than the preservation of the old liberal society at home which has done so much to weaken the

British nation within. In fact they have no viable and forward-looking alternative to Europe at all.

Alone among the organisations opposing the Common Market, the National Front has addressed itself to all the problems of British survival both at home and abroad, and offered a comprehensive programme for national recovery that is radically different to the drift which Britain has followed for generations past, during which she has slid from the position of world's number one power to that of impotent island, economically stagnant and politically effete.

To the National Front, getting out of Europe is merely the first step in a process of national change. From thereon British society and the British economy must be transformed from top to bottom, so as to equip and organise our nation in every way to face the challenges of the modern world.

Finally, there is something we must not forget. Britain went in to the Common Market, not by some accident, but as part of a deliberate policy, planned long beforehand, which involved a massive and treasonable hoax against the British people by politicians and media. Not only must we not get out, we must get rid of the type of people that took us in, whether they be politicians or political propagandists; we must get rid of the enormously powerful politico-financial pressure groups that stood behind them. We must, in short, get rid of the whole treasonable establishment that sold Britain out to Europe.

In this broader task the National Front alone has a policy to offer. This is why all British people who seek a genuine and permanent alternative to the Market betrayal should enlist in the National Front — NOW!

FIND OUT ABOUT THE NATIONAL FRONT

Send 15p for information pack.

Name

Send 20p extra for copy of manifesto for General Election of October, 1974.

Address

To: NATIONAL FRONT
50 PAWSONS ROAD
CROYDON CR0 2QF
(Tel. 01-684 3730)

I enclose